

The group said SDI could only be useful as a component of a first-strike, nuclear war-fighting capacity -- hence, a dangerous, destabilizing project. On theoretical and technical grounds, there was no invulnerable defence against nuclear weapons.

The group saw the SDI as a step which could prompt the Soviet Union to develop counter-measures -- including space weapons.

SDI would also divert governments from the necessity of controlling the nuclear arms race. Canada's role as an arbitrator between the superpowers would be undercut by participation in SDI. Economic benefits to Canada from SDI would likely be insignificant. In any case, it would not only be immoral but foolish to stake the nation's economic welfare on a project which will increase the likelihood of Canada's destruction.

SDI logic flawed

End the Arms Race (Frank Kennedy, president) said Canada's participation in SDI would be criminal. The coalition, a group representing approximately 200 organizations, said SDI was dangerous, expensive and an unnecessary escalation of the arms race. The underlying logic of SDI was fundamentally flawed. That is, an ABM system attempted to combat nuclear weapons that have been launched. This strategy was doomed to failure because of the massive destructive power of nuclear weapons.

Development of an anti-ballistic missile system would cause strategic destabilization. It would increase the first-strike capability of the U.S. It would be an offensive weapon, not a defensive one. An ABM system could only destroy 90 per cent of Soviet missiles fired at the U.S. -- 10 per cent would still get through. But if the U.S. struck first and took out most Soviet